

May 21, 1975

SPEAKER: The rules are suspended. The Clerk will read.

CLERK: Read title to LB 74.

(machine turned off)

CLERK: ... Select File to strike the enacting clause.
Signed, Senator Frank Lewis.

(Senator Savage presiding)

PRESIDENT: Senator Lewis.

SENATOR F. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I realize that the hour is late. However, I cannot pass the opportunity to give you one more chance to cleanse yourselves. LB 328, all the way across, has been a bad bill. You used good judgment earlier in the session by killing it. Subsequent pressure from Mr. Sullivan, subsequent pressure from the federal government has inched this bill forward to this final stage. I would like for one last time, and this is the time, to review with you the contents of the bill and the alleged results with non-passage. The bill is a standard attempt to impose this standard by the Highway Safety Act of 1966, passed by Congress and administered by the bureaucratic structure in the Department of Highway Safety ... the Department of Transportation. They have established this as a standard, and have come to Nebraska and suggested if we did not pass it that we would lose some \$7 million. It has been mentioned at least two or three times that California and other states have not complied to this same request. It has been alleged on this floor that even if they don't comply they are not going to be penalized. Let me tell you how that's going to appear. When I stand here, next January, and Nebraska has passed the law and California hasn't, you're going to find out really how much we mean back in Washington. It's going to come out to a negative zero. I don't think it would hurt one bit not to pass the law. Other than Senator Koch, no one in this body has put forward any legitimate arguments for the passage of the same. No one has suggested that really is a priority with you. I'm sure that when you ran for the office, or when you go back home, the first thing your constituents say to you isn't "Say how about that, you gonna pass that helmet law for us"? I don't believe that's a high demand item within the districts that you represent, or I represent. I think it is a combination of a series of these kind of laws and these kind of mandates that Senator Schmit has addressed himself to earlier today that gets us in these kind of boxes. I hate to see us capitulate. I hate to see us get down on our knees and say "Whatever you want mister, that's what we're going to do." I would hope now that we look at this particular issue with reason. I'm going to try to address it from that standpoint now. First of all, there is the alleged loss of funds. Senator Schmit can testify just as well as I can that the threats were as serious, the consequences